

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/651,036

Applicant(s)

Owen et al.

Examiner

Gregory Mills

Group Art Unit

1742



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory Mills

(3) _____

(2) Michael Levine

(4) _____

Date of Interview 5/29/98Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

Art of record, Martyniuk, Noddin, Art cited in Noddin

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In several brief discussions regarding primarily procedural matters, applicant informed the examiner that they were citing the Noddin patent (5731047) in an IDS, that numerous references were present in the Noddin file wrapper which were not printed on the patent, and that applicant had plans to submit these references for the examiner's consideration as well, as soon as they obtained copies thereof. However, the examiner obtained the Noddin file wrapper and reviewed the references therein without submission thereof by applicant, and accordingly asked applicant not to submit an IDS directed to these references, which are at best cumulative to the art already of record. The examiner also informed applicant of the impending allowance of the case. Also, applicant presented a proposed supplemental amendment for the examiner's review. The examiner had no objections thereto.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

GREGORY L. MILLS
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.